

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed on June 29, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation dated March 10, 1999, and titled "Selling an Idea for a Product" ("PPP"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601 to Markus et al. ("Markus"). Applicants herein amend claims 9, 13, 14, 17 and 22, and cancel claims 12, 15 and 21. As a result, claims 9-11, 13, 14, 16-20 and 22 are pending. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. Further examination and review in view of the amendments and remarks below are respectfully requested.

Applicants' techniques are directed to using presentation templates to automatically generate presentations directed toward presentation targets (e.g., person to which the presentation is to be shown). Some of the techniques utilize presentation templates that include component definitions, which include information bookmarks. Each of the component definitions are associated with a query condition that determines whether the component definition is to be included in a presentation, and the information bookmarks are mapped to items of data regarding a presentation target. When a presentation is generated for a presentation target, the query conditions are checked to determine whether to include the component definition in the presentation, and for the component definitions to include in the presentation, information bookmarks in the template are automatically replaced by their respective items of data.

All of Applicants' claims recite (1) associating a query condition with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation, (2) determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, and (3) for each of the component definitions to include in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, automatically replacing the information bookmark with its mapped opportunity-specific data to generate the slide presentation, or similar language. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner indicated that "Selling a Product or Service" presentation template listing (page 9 of PPP) corresponds to Applicants' query condition associated with each component definition, and that

opening only the slide components associated with the "Selling a Product or Service Template" (page 9 of PPP) corresponds to Applicants' determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition.

Applicants respectfully disagree. PPP does not disclose, suggest or teach associating a query condition with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation, nor does PPP disclose, suggest or teach determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, nor does PPP disclose suggest or teach for each of the component definitions to include in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, automatically replacing the information bookmark with its mapped opportunity-specific data to generate the slide presentation. Instead, PPP is merely a printed copy of a finished or created PowerPoint presentation. Page 9 of PPP makes reference to the title of the presentation being a template, and shows the first page of the presentation in a preview window.

In response to Applicants' argument that PPP does not disclose, suggest or teach a query condition that determines whether a component definition is included in a slide presentation, the examiner noted in an Advisory Action mailed on August 8, 2005, "that the query condition was based on which pre-defined slides (i.e. component definitions) were associated with a specific slide show presentation template when the slide show presentation was queried for creation." In the aforementioned Advisory Action, the Examiner conceded that "[a]s referenced, the MPP2000 only teaches an all inclusive method in which every slide within a specific slide show is selected," but that "[a]s claimed[,] a query condition that results in all components being included is *not precluded*."

Applicants respectfully disagree. As conceded by the Examiner, in MPP2000, every slide within a specific slide show is selected. Therefore, there is no need for MPP2000 to associate a query condition with each component definition, where the

query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation. In MPP2000, all that is needed to select every slide that belongs to a specific slide show is an association between the pre-defined slides (i.e., the component definitions) and the specific slide show template, as noted by the Examiner. Stated another way, the specific slide show template contained an indication of (i.e., identified) the pre-defined slides to include in the slide show. A slide show template that identifies the slides to include in a slide show is different from associating a query condition with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation. Applicants can find in PPP no such disclosure or teaching.

Moreover, to reject a claim or claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness, the Examiner must point to aspects of the prior art reference (or references when combined) that teach or suggest *all* the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974). Rather than providing an indication of where and how the PPP and Markus references teach or suggest Applicants' determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, the Examiner merely stated in the Advisory Action that "[a]s claimed a query condition that results in all components being included is *not precluded*."

Applicants respectfully point out that because the claims include the feature of determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, the Examiner bears the burden of pointing out how this feature is taught or suggested by the prior art references. Applicants' claimed techniques use the query condition that is associated with each component definition to determine whether to include (or omit) the component definition in the slide presentation. Irrespective of the final composition of the slide presentation, the query conditions associated with the component definitions are checked. Applicants can find in PPP no disclosure or suggestion for determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition, as recited.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE – Art Unit: 2178

Attorney Docket No. 38481.8523.us1

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-11, 13, 14, 16-20 and 22 are allowable and ask that this application be passed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8000.

Respectfully Submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 9/7/05



Steven D. Lawrenz
Registration No. 37,376

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000